

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA SYSTEM

BUDGET SUMMARY

	ACTUAL 1998-1999	ACT 10 1999- 2000	EXISTING 1999- 2000	CONTINUATION 2000 - 2001	RECOMMENDED 2000 - 2001	RECOMMENDED OVER/(UNDER) EXISTING
MEANS OF FINANCING:						
STATE GENERAL FUND (Direct)	\$238,573,112	\$234,890,818	\$247,038,426	\$267,750,943	\$244,101,279	(\$2,937,147)
STATE GENERAL FUND BY:						
Interagency Transfers	54,500	54,500	54,500	54,500	54,500	0
Fees & Self-gen. Revenues	171,473,610	178,472,597	178,472,597	178,472,597	181,741,323	3,268,726
Statutory Dedications	5,511,097	0	0	0	0	0
Interim Emergency Board	0	0	0	0	0	0
FEDERAL FUNDS	856,594	1,041,000	1,041,000	1,041,000	1,041,000	0
TOTAL MEANS OF FINANCING	\$416,468,913	\$414,458,915	\$426,606,523	\$447,319,040	\$426,938,102	\$331,579
EXPENDITURES & REQUEST:						
Salaries	\$244,740,070	\$245,421,573	\$252,741,142	\$252,742,948	\$253,095,283	\$354,141
Other Compensation	5,633,969	5,999,098	6,090,187	6,090,187	6,090,187	0
Related Benefits	49,993,464	51,811,777	53,541,025	53,541,387	51,540,848	(2,000,177)
Travel	2,812,468	3,216,776	2,946,182	2,947,089	2,985,722	39,540
Operating Services	38,076,449	39,735,169	39,143,084	42,579,863	40,966,371	1,823,287
Supplies	8,215,100	8,906,704	9,166,592	9,166,857	9,562,354	395,762
Professional Services	2,426,918	2,178,882	2,681,762	2,681,762	2,799,372	117,610
Other Charges	53,062,980	39,807,642	39,392,173	56,663,834	38,529,781	(862,392)
Interagency Transfers	0	8,952,392	9,987,546	9,988,283	10,030,446	42,900
Acquisitions	11,507,495	8,118,849	10,664,230	10,664,230	11,085,138	420,908
Major Repairs	0	310,053	252,600	252,600	252,600	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES AND REQUEST	\$416,468,913	\$414,458,915	\$426,606,523	\$447,319,040	\$426,938,102	\$331,579
AUTHORIZED FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS: Classified	2	4	2	2	2	0
Unclassified	12	13	15	15	15	0
TOTAL	14	17	17	17	17	0

BUDGET SUMMARY BY MEANS OF FINANCING

	STATE GENERAL FUND BY:									
	STATE GENERAL FUND (Direct)		Interagency Transfers		Fees and Self Generated		Statutory Dedications		Interim Emergency Board	
	Recommend 2000-2001	Inc/Dec Over EOB 1999-2000	Recommend 2000-2001	Inc/Dec Over EOB 1999-2000	Recommend 2000-2001	Inc/Dec Over EOB 1999-2000	Recommend 2000-2001	Inc/Dec Over EOB 1999-2000	Recommend 2000-2001	Inc/Dec Over EOB 1999-2000
University of Louisiana Board of Supervisors	\$2,817,733	\$49,166	\$0	\$0	\$280,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nicholls State University	\$20,149,678	(\$55,005)	\$0	\$0	\$15,703,199	\$650,702	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Grambling State University	\$21,208,435	(\$398,184)	\$0	\$0	\$20,411,292	(\$924,282)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Louisiana Tech University	\$33,974,773	(\$559,776)	\$0	\$0	\$27,288,574	\$1,704,574	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
McNeese State University	\$21,633,798	(\$272,361)	\$0	\$0	\$15,247,856	\$116,252	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
University of Louisiana - Monroe	\$35,545,771	(\$407,914)	\$0	\$0	\$21,761,876	\$245,730	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Northwestern State University	\$23,828,071	(\$365,531)	\$54,500	\$0	\$20,016,310	\$1,223,839	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Southeastern Louisiana University	\$36,967,120	(\$458,904)	\$0	\$0	\$28,817,459	\$104,826	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
University of Louisiana - Lafayette	\$47,975,900	(\$468,638)	\$0	\$0	\$32,214,757	\$147,085	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$244,101,279	(\$2,937,147)	\$54,500	\$0	\$181,741,323	\$3,268,726	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

	Federal Funds		Total Means of Financing	
	Recommend 2000-2001	Inc/Dec Over EOB 1999-2000	Recommend 2000-2001	Inc/Dec Over EOB 1999-2000
University of Louisiana Board of Supervisors	\$0	\$0	\$3,097,733	\$49,166
Nicholls State University	\$90,000	\$0	\$35,942,877	\$595,697
Grambling State University	\$330,000	\$0	\$41,949,727	(\$1,322,466)
Louisiana Tech University	\$16,000	\$0	\$61,279,347	\$1,144,798
McNeese State University	\$125,000	\$0	\$37,006,654	(\$156,109)
University of Louisiana - Monroe	\$0	\$0	\$57,307,647	(\$162,184)
Northwestern State University	\$0	\$0	\$43,898,881	\$858,308
Southeastern Louisiana University	\$480,000	\$0	\$66,264,579	(\$354,078)
University of Louisiana - Lafayette	\$0	\$0	\$80,190,657	(\$321,553)
Total	\$1,041,000	\$0	\$426,938,102	\$331,579

This agency's recommended appropriation does not include any funds for short-term debt.

In addition to the above recommended appropriation, \$21,661,674 will be paid in Fiscal Year 2000-2001 for long-term debt incurred on behalf of this agency from the previous sale of bonds. Total long-term debt service payments for the state for Fiscal Year 2000-2001 are reflected in the Governor's Executive Budget Supporting Document in Non-Appropriated Requirements, Schedule 22-922.

This agency's recommended appropriation also includes the following amount by means of financing for payments on the unfunded accrued liability of the Louisiana State Employees' Retirement System and the Teachers' Retirement System in accordance with the provisions of Article X, Section 29 of the Constitution of Louisiana:

State General Fund (Direct)	\$9,960,112
State General Fund by:	\$0
Interagency Transfers	2,234
Fees & Self-gen Revenues	7,639,227
Statutory Dedications	0
Federal Funds	39,049
Total	\$17,640,623

	ACTUAL 1998-1999	ACT 10 1999- 2000	EXISTING 1999- 2000	CONTINUATION 2000 - 2001	RECOMMENDED 2000 - 2001	RECOMMENDED OVER/(UNDER) EXISTING
Higher Education Initiatives Fund: Higher Education Library and Scientific Acquisitions Account	\$5,511,097	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$

ANALYSIS OF RECOMMENDATION

GENERAL FUND	TOTAL	T.O.	DESCRIPTION
\$234,890,818	\$414,458,915	17	ACT 10 FISCAL YEAR 1999-2000
			BA-7 TRANSACTIONS:
\$12,108,538	\$12,108,538	0	Fiscal Year 1999-2000 Formula Enhancement pool distribution for current operations (\$7,031,009) and the Faculty Pay increase (\$5,077,529)
\$39,070	\$39,070	0	Carry forward used for late delivery of automobile purchase
\$247,038,426	\$426,606,523	17	EXISTING OPERATING BUDGET – December 3, 1999
(\$2,063,066)	(\$2,063,066)	0	Teacher Retirement Rate Adjustment
(\$988,455)	\$802,598	0	Risk Management Adjustment
(\$39,070)	(\$39,070)	0	Non-Recurring Carry Forwards
(\$32,092)	(\$32,092)	0	Legislative Auditor Fees
\$685	\$685	0	UPS Fees
\$42,215	\$42,215	0	Civil Service Fees
\$0	\$2,277,673	0	Workload Adjustments - Increases in Fees and Self-generated Revenues for Nicholls State (\$700,000), Louisiana Tech (\$1,400,000) and Northwestern State (\$1,177,673) due to enrollment and out of state tuition increases and a decrease at Grambling State (\$1,000,000) due to a decline in enrollment

\$42,636	\$42,636	0	Workload Adjustments - Higher Education Consent Decree - 1994 Settlement Agreement mandate to provide for Other Race Graduate Programs at Grambling State
\$0	(\$800,000)	0	Other Adjustments - Reclassify Act 971 appropriation as an off budget account
\$100,000	\$100,000	0	New and Expanded Adjustment - Provide funding to Nicholls State for the New Orleans Saints Preseason Training Camp
\$244,101,279	\$426,938,102	17	TOTAL RECOMMENDED
\$0	\$0	0	LESS GOVERNOR'S SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS
\$244,101,279	\$426,938,102	17	BASE EXECUTIVE BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001
			SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS CONTINGENT ON SALES TAX RENEWAL:
\$0	\$0	0	None
\$0	\$0	0	TOTAL SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS CONTINGENT ON SALES TAX RENEWAL
			SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS CONTINGENT ON NEW REVENUE:
\$0	\$0	0	None
\$0	\$0	0	TOTAL SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS CONTINGENT ON NEW REVENUE
\$244,101,279	\$426,938,102	17	GRAND TOTAL RECOMMENDED

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

\$0	The University of Louisiana Board of Supervisors does not have a specific allocation for Professional Services for Fiscal Year 2000-20001
\$2,799,372	Funding for Professional Services for the Higher Education Formula Institutions Schools in the University of Louisiana System
\$2,799,372	TOTAL PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

OTHER CHARGES

University of Louisiana Board of Supervisors

\$192	Civil Service Fees
\$17	Comprehensive Public Training Program (CPTP)
\$4,214	Legislative Auditor Fees
\$677	Uniform Payroll System (UPS)
\$1,618,034	Funds associated with the Desegregation Settlement Agreement to be distributed by the University of Louisiana Board of Supervisors to Grambling State University, Louisiana Tech University, the University of Louisiana at Monroe and the University of Louisiana at Lafayette
\$36,906,647	Funding for Other Charges for the Higher Education Formula Institutions in the University of Louisiana System
\$38,529,781	SUB-TOTAL OTHER CHARGES

Interagency Transfers:

\$862	Uniform Payroll System (UPS) and Civil Service Fees for the University of Louisiana Board of Supervisors
\$10,029,584	Funding for Interagency Transfers for the Higher Education Formula Institutions in the University of Louisiana System
\$10,030,446	SUB-TOTAL INTERAGENCY TRANSFERS
\$48,560,227	TOTAL OTHER CHARGES

ACQUISITIONS AND MAJOR REPAIRS

\$28,905	Office and computer equipment for the University of Louisiana Board of Supervisors
\$11,056,233	Funding for Acquisitions for the Higher Education Formula Institutions in the University of Louisiana System
\$0	The University of Louisiana Board of Supervisors does not have a specific allocation for Major Repairs for Fiscal Year 2000-2001
\$252,600	Funding for Major Repairs for the Higher Education Formula Institutions in the University of Louisiana System
\$11,337,738	TOTAL ACQUISITIONS AND MAJOR REPAIRS

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Program Authorization: Constitution of 1974, Article 8, Sections 6 and 11; R.S. 17:1834; 17: Chapter 26

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Role, Scope, and Mission Statement: To supervise and manage the institutions within the system, as constitutionally prescribed, in order for them to more effectively serve the educational needs of the citizens of the state.

The goals of the University of Louisiana System are:

1. To maximize educational opportunities for all citizens served by System institutions.
2. To enhance overall quality and effectiveness of the University of Louisiana System.
3. To increase accountability and efficiency of operations.

OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Unless otherwise indicated, all objectives are to be accomplished during or by the end of FY 2000-2001. Performance indicators are made up of two parts: name and value. The indicator name describes what is being measured. The indicator value is the numeric value or level achieved within a given measurement period. For budgeting purposes, performance indicator values are shown for the prior fiscal year, the current fiscal year, and alternative funding scenarios (continuation budget level and Executive Budget recommendation level) for the ensuing fiscal year (the fiscal year of the budget document).

The objectives and performance indicators that appear below are associated with program funding in the Base Executive Budget for FY 2000-01. Specific information on program funding is presented in the financial sections that follow performance tables.

1. (KEY) To encourage member institutions to increase the number of distance learning courses offered per institution either through conventional broadcast video, interactive video, Internet or other media by 3 by Spring 2001.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of course offerings on interactive video in System	Not applicable ¹	18 ²	25 ³	25	33 ⁴	33
K	Average number of new courses per institution	Not applicable ¹	Not available	3	3 ⁵	3	3
S	Number of distance learning courses in System	Not applicable ¹	53 ²	125	125 ⁶	199 ⁴	199

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Data inconclusive due to transition of responsibility at BOR.

³ High promotion by BOR and BOSULS resulted in greater than anticipated response from universities.

⁴ System has exceeded original goal but due to emphasis placed on technology, System will continue to encourage institutions to promote distance learning.

⁵ Although the performance standard is 3, the system estimates a better number to be 5.

⁶ Although the performance standard is 125, the system estimates a better number to be 175.

2. (SUPPORTING) To have each institution in the System increase the number of new curricular offerings by 1 by Fall 2000.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.2

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Average number of new curricula offered per institution in System	Not applicable ¹	Not applicable	1	1	1	1

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

3. (SUPPORTING) To maintain the current number of courses that articulate among institutions in the statewide Articulation Guide through Fall 2000.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.3

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Number of courses articulating among System institutions	Not applicable ¹	Not available	534	534 ²	465	465
S	Percentage change in courses that articulate	Not applicable ¹	Not available	5.0%	5.0%	0.0% ³	0.0%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² 8 universities only (community colleges no longer in System). "Actuals" may not increase due to the System becoming part of statewide effort. System estimates a better number to be 465.

³ This objective is no longer achievable at the increase originally anticipated because of change from System to statewide Articulation Guide.

4. (KEY) To increase minority enrollment Systemwide 0.2% by Fall 2000.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.4

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Percentage change in minority enrollment	Not applicable ¹	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
S	Percentage of minority students in System	Not applicable ¹	28.8%	31.8%	31.8% ²	29.1%	29.1%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² 8 universities only (community colleges no longer in System). Although the performance standard is 31.8%, the System estimates a better number to be 29.1%.

5. (KEY) To maintain the current number and percentage of eligible accredited programs within the System through Fall 2000.

Strategic Link: Goal II, Objective II.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Percentage eligible programs accredited	Not applicable ¹	88.8%	80.0%	80.0% ²	85.0%	85.0%
S	Number of programs eligible for accreditation	Not applicable ¹	357	405	405 ³	353	353

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Due to the elimination of programs by the Board of Regents, the number of accredited programs declined; however, because System administration has encouraged universities to aggressively seek accreditation, the performance standard is set higher than original goal. Therefore, the agency estimates a better number to be 83%.

³ Although the performance standard is 405, the agency estimates a better number to be 353.

6. (KEY) To increase the System's 6 year graduation rate by 1.0% by Fall 2000.

Strategic Link: Goal II, Objective II.2

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Six-year graduation rate for first-time full-time freshman	Not applicable ¹	32.2% ²	30.1%	30.1% ²	33.2%	33.2%
K	Percentage difference in number of cohorts graduating from System institutions	Not applicable ¹	2.5% ²	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² 8 universities currently in the System. Although the standard is 30.1%, this agency estimates a better number to be 32.2%.

7. (SUPPORTING) To eliminate all (100%) repeat audit findings in System institutions by Fall 2000.

Strategic Link: Goal III, Objective III.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Number of repeat audit findings	Not applicable ¹	Not available	0	0	0	0
S	Percentage of total findings that are repeat findings	Not applicable ¹	Not available	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard in 1998-99.

8. (KEY) To have 100% of the System's institutions completing Phase I and Phase II of a comprehensive master plan.

Strategic Link: Goal III, Objective III.4

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	System average of institutions completing Phase I	Not applicable ¹	37.0% ²	75.0%	75.0%	100.0%	100.0%
K	System average of institutions completing Phase II	Not applicable ¹	0.0% ²	60.0%	60.0%	100.0%	100.0%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² 8 universities only (community colleges are no longer in the System).

NICHOLLS STATE UNIVERSITY

Program Authorization: Act 280 of 1956; Act 93 of 1970

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Role, Scope, and Mission Statement: Nicholls State University, a comprehensive regional university serving the higher education needs of citizens of south central Louisiana, provides academic programs and support services for traditional and non-traditional students while promoting the economic and cultural infrastructure of the region.

The goals of Nicholls State University are:

1. To improve access to higher education for all citizens in the region.
2. To improve the quality and effectiveness of the academic programs and support services provided by the university.
3. To expand the university's contributions to the economic and cultural development of the region.
4. To increase accountability of the university to all of its constituents.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE INFORMATION:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1995-96	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1997-98	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1999-00
Category: SREB FOUR-YEAR 5 ¹			
Admissions Criteria			YES
Student headcount	7,345	7,173	7,348
Student full time equivalent (FTE)	6,200	6,589	6,739
Degrees/awards conferred	942	880	Due 10/00
State dollars per FTE	\$2,792	\$3,021	\$3,052
Percentage of SREB benchmark	N/A ²	N/A ²	68.5%
Undergraduate mandatory attendance fees	\$2,017	\$2,136	\$2,168
Percentage of SREB benchmark	106.2%	101.7%	Due Fall '00
Mean composite ACT score	18.7	18.6	Due 3/00
Retention of First time freshmen from previous fall			
Campus level	58.5%	59.2%	55.6%
Public post-secondary system	67.7%	67.2%	64.9%
Program accreditation rate	N/A ³	N/A ³	90.0%
Three/six year graduation rate	N/A ⁴	26.0%	Due 6/00

¹ Institution awarding at least 30 master's, education specialist, post-master's, or doctoral degrees.

² Due to the adoption of a new formula funding, figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

³ Following an 18 month review, BOR adopted mandatory/recommended disciplines for accreditation, therefore figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

⁴ The Federal Department of Education's methodology for calculating graduation rates was implemented in 1997.

OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Unless otherwise indicated, all objectives are to be accomplished during or by the end of FY 2000-2001. Performance indicators are made up of two parts: name and value. The indicator name describes what is being measured. The indicator value is the numeric value or level achieved within a given measurement period. For budgeting purposes, performance indicator values are shown for the prior fiscal year, the current fiscal year, and alternative funding scenarios (continuation budget level and Executive Budget recommendation level) for the ensuing fiscal year (the fiscal year of the budget document).

The objectives and performance indicators that appear below are associated with program funding in the Base Executive Budget for FY 2000-01. Specific information on program funding is presented in the financial sections that follow performance tables.

1. (KEY) To increase total student enrollment from primary service area by at least .13%.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of students from primary service area ¹	Not applicable ²	14,840 ³	14,400	14,400 ⁴	14,910	14,910
K	Percentage increase in number of students from primary service area	Not applicable ²	4.74%	0.35%	0.35% ⁵	0.13%	0.13%

¹ Primary service area includes parishes of Ascension, Assumption, Jefferson, Lafourche, St. Charles, St. James, St. Mary, and Terrebonne.

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

³ Numbers could be negatively impacted should a community college be established in the primary service area.

⁴ Although the performance standard is 14,400, the agency estimates a better number to be 14,890.

⁵ Although the performance standard is .35%, the agency estimates a better number to be .34%.

2. (KEY) To develop and sign articulation agreements with 7 of the 8 primary parishes.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of articulation agreements	Not applicable ¹	3	5	5	7	7

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

3. (SUPPORTING) To increase the number of formal contacts by faculty with prospective students in the region as well as admission counselor visitations by 1.67%.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.2

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Percentage increase in the number of faculty who make formal contacts ¹	Not applicable ²	2.30%	2.30%	2.30%	1.67%	1.67%
S	Percentage increase in admission counselor visitations	Not applicable ²	2.90%	2.90%	2.90%	1.67%	1.67%

¹ Formal contacts as reported annually by faculty include: External: speaking to organized groups of high school students; participating in organized career day functions at area schools; participating with high school recruiters on a recruiting visit; Internal: talking to students before or after administering rally tests; talking to students during science or social studies fairs; participating in organized functions for prospective students on campus; participating in organized activities for prospective students; participating in the gifted and talented programs as an invited speaker.

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

4. (KEY) To maintain the percentage of programs accredited.

Strategic Link: Goal II, Objective II.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of programs eligible for accreditation	Not applicable ¹	31	31	31	31	31
K	Percentage of accredited programs	Not applicable ¹	90.3%	93.5%	93.5%	93.5%	93.5%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

5. (KEY) To maintain a level of Education and General (E & G) expenditures budgeted to the category of instruction that is 1% higher than the average of the University of Louisiana System.

Strategic Link: Goal IV, Objective IV.3

Explanatory Note: This objective has been adjusted from the strategic plan to compare to the University of Louisiana System instead of SREB V.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Percentage of E & G budgeted for instruction	Not applicable ¹	53.88%	52.50%	52.50% ²	52.50%	52.50%
K	Percentage difference for instruction between Nicholls and University of Louisiana System	Not applicable ¹	4.55%	2.50%	2.50% ³	2.50%	2.50%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Although the performance standard is 52.50%, the agency estimates a better number to be 52.88%.

³ Although the performance standard is 2.50%, the agency estimates a better number to be 3.39%.

GRAMBLING STATE UNIVERSITY

Program Authorization: Constitution of 1974, Article 8; Act 178 of 1974

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Role, Scope, and Mission Statement: Grambling State University, a state-supported co-educational institution, was originally created for the purpose of meeting the educational, cultural and social needs of the African American citizens of the north central region of the state of Louisiana. The mission of the university has evolved and now focuses on undergraduate, graduate, and professional degree programs as well as programs in continuing and international education. All programs are designed to meet the educational, cultural and social needs of a diversified state, national and international clientele.

The goals of Grambling State University are:

1. To stabilize the student enrollment to ensure the recruitment of quality students and to increase the number of Louisiana residents at Grambling State University.
2. To strengthen and enhance the quality of academic degree programs to prepare students to meet the needs of a changing society.
3. To enrich the quality of student life and provide opportunities for total student development.
4. To advance the institution through a program of development involving fundraising, positive relations with the public, corporate sector, and other institutions and agencies.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE INFORMATION:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1995-96	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1997-98	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1999-00
Category: SREB FOUR-YEAR 4 ¹			
Admissions Criteria			NO
Student headcount	7,444	5,862	4,671
Student full time equivalent (FTE)	6,589	6,112	4,963
Degrees/awards conferred	1,129	1,046	Due 10/00
State dollars per FTE	\$2,829	\$3,278	\$4,150
Percentage of SREB benchmark	N/A ²	N/A ²	90.0%
Undergraduate mandatory attendance fees	\$2,088	\$2,088	\$2,301
Percentage of SREB benchmark	108.1%	95.1%	Due Fall '00
Mean composite ACT score	16.1	16.0	Due 3/00
Retention of First time freshmen from previous fall			
Campus level	59.3%	59.4%	63.4%
Public post-secondary system	62.3%	63.0%	67.2%
Program accreditation rate	N/A ³	N/A ³	66.7%
Three/six year graduation rate	N/A ⁴	33.5%	Due 6/00

¹ Institution awarding at least 30 master's, education specialist, post-master's, or doctoral degrees with master's, education specialist, and post-master's degrees distributed among at least 5 CIP categories.

² Due to the adoption of a new formula funding, figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

³ Following an 18 month review, BOR adopted mandatory/recommended disciplines for accreditation, therefore figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

⁴ The Federal Department of Education's methodology for calculating graduation rates was implemented in 1997.

OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Unless otherwise indicated, all objectives are to be accomplished during or by the end of FY 2000-2001. Performance indicators are made up of two parts: name and value. The indicator name describes what is being measured. The indicator value is the numeric value or level achieved within a given measurement period. For budgeting purposes, performance indicator values are shown for the prior fiscal year, the current fiscal year, and alternative funding scenarios (continuation budget level and Executive Budget recommendation level) for the ensuing fiscal year (the fiscal year of the budget document).

The objectives and performance indicators that appear below are associated with program funding in the Base Executive Budget for FY 2000-01. Specific information on program funding is presented in the financial sections that follow performance tables.

1. (KEY) To increase the number of students meeting Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) requirements by 2%.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.2

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Students meeting SAP requirements	Not applicable ¹	4,383	Not applicable ²	4,471 ³	4,560	4,560
K	Percentage increase of students who meet SAP requirements	Not applicable ¹	Not available	Not applicable ²	2% ³	2%	2%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 10 and therefore has no performance standard for 1999-00.

³ Since this performance indicator has no 1999-00 performance standard, this figure is an estimate.

2. (KEY) To increase by 3% the number of faculty with terminal degrees in their respective teaching fields or closely related field.

Strategic Link: Goal II, Objective II.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Faculty with terminal degrees in their teaching fields or closely related fields	Not applicable ¹	143	Not applicable ²	155 ³	160	160
K	Percentage of faculty with terminal degrees in their teaching fields or closely related fields	Not applicable ¹	55%	Not applicable ²	59% ³	62%	62%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 10 and therefore has no performance standard for 1999-00.

³ Since this performance indicator has no 1999-00 performance standard, this is an estimate.

3. (KEY) To provide at least 2 professional development activities for 100% of faculty.

Strategic Link: Goal II, Objective II.3

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Total professional development activities	Not applicable ¹	10	Not applicable ²	12 ³	14	14

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 10 and therefore has no performance standard for 1999-00.

³ Since there is no performance standard, this is an estimate.

4. (KEY) To foster and maintain dialogue and continuous communication with 2 defunct and at least 2 new GSU alumni chapters.

Strategic Link: Goal IV, Objective IV.4

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of new and reactivated alumni chapters	Not applicable ¹	4	Not applicable ²	2 ³	4	4
S	Number of GSU alumni chapters	Not applicable ¹	49	Not applicable ²	54 ³	56	56

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 10 and therefore has no performance standard for 1999-00.

³ Since there is no performance standard, this is an estimate.

5. (KEY) To initiate at least 2 new activities in the areas of Public Safety, Judicial Affairs, Housing and Residential Life by Spring 2001.

Strategic Link:

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of activities currently available	Not applicable ¹	Not applicable	Not applicable ²	8 ³	10	10
K	Number of new activities	Not applicable ¹	Not applicable	Not applicable ²	0 ³	2	2

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard in 1998-99.

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 10 and therefore has no performance standard in 1999-00.

³ Since there is no performance standard, this is an estimate.

LOUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY

Program Authorization: Constitution of 1974, Article 8;

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Role, Scope, and Mission Statement: Louisiana Tech University serves primarily the citizens of north Louisiana. Louisiana Tech University has admissions criteria and offers baccalaureate programs in a broad range of studies in the arts, humanities, liberal arts and sciences and in professional areas such as agriculture, allied health, architecture, aviation, business, education, engineering, and forestry. The university offers several master's programs and offers doctoral/research programs in the areas of business administration, engineering, computational analysis, and counseling psychology. It also participates in a unique consortium with Grambling State University and Northeast Louisiana University to offer an Ed.D. program in Curriculum/Instruction and Educational Readership. As the only university in north Louisiana with a college of engineering, La. Tech serves engineering needs throughout central and north Louisiana.

The goals of Louisiana Tech University are:

1. To increase the enrollment of and maintain the retention rate of first-time freshmen.
2. To develop and integrate the use of advanced technology in areas of university life.
3. To provide a streamlined, efficient infrastructure necessary to facilitate research and scholarly activity.
4. To enhance faculty, administrator, and staff human resources through professional development and training.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE INFORMATION:			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1995-96	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1997-98	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1999-00
Category: SREB FOUR-YEAR 3 ¹			
Admissions Criteria			YES
Student headcount	9,584	9,500	10,014
Student full time equivalent (FTE)	8,386	9,203	9,413
Degrees/awards conferred	1,776	1,754	Due 10/00
State dollars per FTE	\$3,594	\$3,713	\$3,733
Percentage of SREB benchmark	N/A ²	N/A ²	71.1%
Undergraduate mandatory attendance fees	\$2,274	\$2,547	\$2,559
Percentage of SREB benchmark	118.6%	116.7%	Due Fall '00
Mean composite ACT score	22.1	22.1	Due 3/00
Retention of First time freshmen from previous fall			
Campus level	65.8%	71.1%	70.3%
Public post-secondary system	73.9%	78.9%	79.4%
Program accreditation rate	N/A ³	N/A ³	96.7%
Three/six year graduation rate	N/A ⁴	39.5%	Due 6/00

¹ Institution awarding at least 100 master's, education specialists, post-master's, or doctoral degrees with master's, education specialist, and post-master's degrees distributed among at least 10 CIP categories.

² Due to the adoption of a new formula funding, figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

³ Following an 18 month review, BOR adopted mandatory/recommended disciplines for accreditation, therefore figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

⁴ The Federal Department of Education's methodology for calculating graduation rates was implemented in 1997.

OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Unless otherwise indicated, all objectives are to be accomplished during or by the end of FY 2000-2001. Performance indicators are made up of two parts: name and value. The indicator name describes what is being measured. The indicator value is the numeric value or level achieved within a given measurement period. For budgeting purposes, performance indicator values are shown for the prior fiscal year, the current fiscal year, and alternative funding scenarios (continuation budget level and Executive Budget recommendation level) for the ensuing fiscal year (the fiscal year of the budget document).

The objectives and performance indicators that appear below are associated with program funding in the Base Executive Budget for FY 2000-01. Specific information on program funding is presented in the financial sections that follow performance tables.

1. (KEY) To increase the enrollment of first-time freshman (FTF) by 18.00%.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.1

Explanatory Note: The objective was revised and substantially increased from the previous year because first-time freshman enrollment exceeded the goals in the past several years. However, data from the nationally recognized study in enrollment trends conducted by the Western Commission for Higher Education, which predicts the size of each state's high school graduating class through the year 2011-12, indicate a decline in the high school graduates who would be first-time freshmen in Fall 2000. The revised objective takes this into account.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Percentage change in enrollment (Fall 1997 baseline)	Not applicable ¹	17.00%	3.75%	3.75% ²	18.00%	18.00%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Although the performance standard is 3.75%, the agency estimates a better number to be 11.7%.

2. (KEY) To retain at least 75% of first-time, full-time, baccalaureate degree candidate freshmen.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.2

Explanatory Note: According to ACT's 1998 *National Dropout and Graduation Rate* report, the average freshman-to-sophomore persistence rate across 2,545 public and private two- and four-year colleges and universities was 66.9%.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Percentage of freshman cohort retained to sophomore year	Not applicable ¹	75% ²	75%	75%	75%	75%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard in 1998-99.

² Retention rates are calculated from Fall Quarter enrollment figures using an unduplicated headcount.

3. (KEY) To increase the number of distance learning courses either through conventional broadcast video, interactive video, Internet, or other media to 21.

Strategic Link: Goal II, Objective II.2

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of new distance learning courses offered (AY 1997-98 as a baseline)	Not applicable ¹	13	3	3 ²	10	10
S	Total number of distance learning courses offered per year	Not applicable ¹	14	7	7 ³	21	21

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Although the performance standard is 3, the agency estimates a better number to be 14.

³ Although the performance standard is 7, the agency estimates a better number to be 14.

4. (SUPPORTING) To increase services offered to encourage and support research and scholarly efforts by 900%.

Strategic Link: Goal III, Objective III.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Number of service-oriented activities (baseline 1997-98)	Not applicable ¹	6	8	8 ²	10	10
S	Percentage change in number of service-oriented activities to (baseline 1997-98)	Not applicable ¹	500% ²	33%	33% ²	900% ³	900%

¹ This performance did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Projections in LaPAS were derived using previous year as performance standard.

³ Exceeded projection as a result of increased emphasis on service-oriented infrastructure and university strategic planning master plan focus on research infrastructure.

5. (SUPPORTING) To increase participation of faculty in research and scholarly activities by 5% and level of research/scholarly support by 73%.

Strategic Link: Goal III, Objective III.2

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Number of faculty applying for research/scholarly activity support	Not applicable ¹	208	200	200	210	210
S	Percentage change over previous year	Not applicable ¹	13%	5%	5%	5%	5%
S	Amount of research/scholarly support	Not applicable ¹	\$5,112,429	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$5,386,050	\$5,386,050
S	Percentage change (baseline of 1997-98)	Not applicable ¹	64.0% ²	14.0%	14.0%	73.0%	73.0%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Compared to \$3,116,343, amount of research/scholarly support in AY 1997-98 which was a decrease over AY 1996-97. Exceeded projection as a result of university's increased emphasis on service-oriented research infrastructure.

6. (KEY) To increase amount expended by 10% for faculty, administrator, and staff professional development.

Strategic Link: Goal IV, Objective IV.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Amount expended for professional development ¹	Not applicable ²	\$84,919	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$137,500	\$137,500
K	Percentage change in amount expended for professional development over previous year	Not applicable ²	81%	15%	15%	10%	10%

¹ Professional development and training activities include conferences, teleconferences, seminars; professional development courses; sabbatical leaves; faculty research grants; instructional innovation activities; and the newly established Center for Educational Excellence providing campus-wide activities.

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

7. (KEY) To increase the number of service-oriented professional development activities offered for faculty and administrators by 24%.

Strategic Link: Goal IV, Objective IV.2

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of service-oriented professional development activities offered	Not applicable ¹	18	17	17 ²	21	21
K	Percentage change in number of service-oriented activities over previous year	Not applicable ¹	20%	13%	13% ²	24% ³	24%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Projections is LaPAS were based on 1997-98 as baseline. Note that the performance indicator now uses the previous year's figure rather than the original 1997-98 baseline figure.

³ Projection is based upon increased emphasis on professional development and the newly established Center for Educational Excellence providing campus-wide activities.

McNEESE STATE UNIVERSITY

Program Authorization: R.S. 17:3217

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Role, Scope, and Mission Statement: McNeese State University provides associate, baccalaureate, masters' and specialist degree programs in various disciplines to meet the needs of citizens, businesses, and industries in southwest Louisiana.

The goals of McNeese State University are:

1. To improve access to higher education for citizens in southwest Louisiana.
2. To improve the overall quality and effectiveness of higher education programs and services offered at McNeese State University.
3. To expand McNeese State University's contribution to economic and social development in southwest Louisiana.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE INFORMATION:			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1995-96	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1997-98	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1999-00
Category: SREB FOUR-YEAR 4 ¹			
Admissions Criteria			YES
Student headcount	8,425	8,117	7,879
Student full time equivalent (FTE)	7,160	7,172	6,879
Degrees/awards conferred	1,059	1,150	Due 10/00
State dollars per FTE	\$2,552	\$2,971	\$3,256
Percentage of SREB benchmark	N/A ²	N/A ²	73.1%
Undergraduate mandatory attendance fees	\$2,006	\$2,006	\$2,113
Percentage of SREB benchmark	103.8%	91.4%	Due Fall '00
Mean composite ACT score	18.9	19.4	Due 3/00
Retention of First time freshmen from previous fall			
Campus level	52.5%	54.3%	58.1%
Public post-secondary system	56.6%	59.2%	61.3%
Program accreditation rate	N/A ³	N/A ³	77.1%
Three/six year graduation rate	N/A ⁴	26.8%	Due 6/00

¹ Institution awarding at least 30 master's, education specialist, post-master's, or doctoral degrees with master's, education specialist, and post-master's degrees distributed among at least 5 CIP categories.

² Due to the adoption of a new formula funding, figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

³ Following an 18 month review, BOR adopted mandatory/recommended disciplines for accreditation, therefore figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

⁴ The Federal Department of Education's methodology for calculating graduation rates was implemented in 1997.

OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Unless otherwise indicated, all objectives are to be accomplished during or by the end of FY 2000-2001. Performance indicators are made up of two parts: name and value. The indicator name describes what is being measured. The indicator value is the numeric value or level achieved within a given measurement period. For budgeting purposes, performance indicator values are shown for the prior fiscal year, the current fiscal year, and alternative funding scenarios (continuation budget level and Executive Budget recommendation level) for the ensuing fiscal year (the fiscal year of the budget document).

The objectives and performance indicators that appear below are associated with program funding in the Base Executive Budget for FY 2000-01. Specific information on program funding is presented in the financial sections that follow performance tables.

1. (SUPPORTING) To increase the number of courses offered via compressed video.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Increased number of courses offered via all distance compressed video	Not applicable ¹	1	6	6	12	12

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 10 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

2. (KEY) To provide faculty development for at least 30 faculty in the methods for delivery and/or receipt of instruction via distance learning technologies.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.3

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of faculty participating in faculty development for delivery of instruction via compressed video	Not applicable ¹	0	30	30	30	30

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

3. (SUPPORTING) To increase by 3 the number of new programs by Fall 2000.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.4

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Number of new programs offered at McNeese	Not applicable ¹	0	3	3	3	3
S	Number of students enrolled in new programs	Not applicable ¹	0	40	40	60	60

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

4. (KEY) To maintain the number of accredited programs at McNeese by Spring 2001.

Strategic Link: Goal II, Objective II.1

LEVEL		PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Total of accredited programs at McNeese	Not applicable ¹	32	32	32	37 ²	37
K	Percentage of programs deemed essential by Board of Regents which are accredited	Not applicable ¹	Not available	Not applicable ³	82% ⁴	86%	86%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² This number is increased due to a reorganization of programs.

³ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 10 and therefore has no performance standard for 1999-00.

⁴ In October 1999, the Board of Regents submitted for approval the list of "mandatory" programs for accreditation; McNeese has 28 programs requiring mandatory accreditation; of these programs 23 are accredited.

5. (SUPPORTING) External audit reports will have 0 repeat findings.

Strategic Link: Goal IV, Objective IV.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Audit report findings ¹	Not applicable ²	1	0	0	0	0
S	Repeat audit report findings	Not applicable	0	0	0	0	0

¹ Refers to Legislative Audit Reports.

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA - MONROE

Program Authorization: Constitution of 1974, Article 8;

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Role, Scope, and Mission Statement: The University of Louisiana at Monroe currently serves a student body of 10,500 students offering undergraduate degree programs in business administration, education, liberal arts, pharmacy and health sciences, and pure and applied sciences, in addition to graduate programs in education and pharmacy. The university continues to develop and deliver high quality and cost-effective academic and service programs to serve the higher education needs of Louisiana's citizens, business, industry and government. Specifically, University of Louisiana at Monroe will continue to be recognized for offering excellent academic programs in the health, natural and environmental sciences, business development, education and family studies consistent with a Carnegie Doctoral Level II university. Additionally, University of Louisiana at Monroe is committed to serving as an academic gateway by developing teaching, research, and public service programs to meet the needs of the Lower Mississippi Delta region.

The goals of the University of Louisiana at Monroe are:

1. To promote and sustain academic excellence in university degree programs.
2. To improve opportunities for student success.
3. To improve and maintain the quality of university financial resources and physical facilities supporting the mission.
4. To promote and sustain the academic reputation of the university consistent with its mission, achievements and vision for the next century.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE INFORMATION:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1995-96	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1997-98	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1999-00
Category: SREB FOUR-YEAR 3 ¹			
Admissions Criteria			NO
Student headcount	11,553	10,942	9,947
Student full time equivalent (FTE)	10,373	10,727	10,082
Degrees/awards conferred	1,646	1,635	Due 10/00
State dollars per FTE	\$2,862	\$3,172	\$3,632
Percentage of SREB benchmark	N/A ²	N/A ²	71.2%
Undergraduate mandatory attendance fees	\$1,932	\$1,932	\$2,056
Percentage of SREB benchmark	100.8%	88.5%	Due Fall '00
Mean composite ACT score	19.1	19.2	Due 3/00
Retention of First time freshmen from previous fall			
Campus level	60.3%	63.4%	59.1%
Public post-secondary system	65.4%	68.9%	65.3%
Program accreditation rate	N/A ³	N/A ³	96.3%
Three/six year graduation rate	N/A ⁴	28.8%	Due 6/00

¹ Institution awarding at least 100 master's, education specialist, post-master's, or doctoral degrees with master's, education specialist, and post-master's degrees distributed among at least 10 CIP categories.

² Due to the adoption of a new formula funding, figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

³ Following an 18 month review, BOR adopted mandatory/recommended disciplines for accreditation, therefore figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

⁴ The Federal Department of Education's methodology for calculating graduation rates implemented in 1997.

OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Unless otherwise indicated, all objectives are to be accomplished during or by the end of FY 2000-2001. Performance indicators are made up of two parts: name and value. The indicator name describes what is being measured. The indicator value is the numeric value or level achieved within a given measurement period. For budgeting purposes, performance indicator values are shown for the prior fiscal year, the current fiscal year, and alternative funding scenarios (continuation budget level and Executive Budget recommendation level) for the ensuing fiscal year (the fiscal year of the budget document).

The objectives and performance indicators that appear below are associated with program funding in the Base Executive Budget for FY 2000-01. Specific information on program funding is presented in the financial sections that follow performance tables.

1. (KEY) To implement systematic reviews of 10% of academic programs not currently reviewed by accrediting agencies and/or governing boards.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of programs subject to review	Not applicable ¹	40	40	40	27 ²	27
K	Percentage of programs reviewed	Not applicable ¹	0%	10%	10%	10%	10%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² The newly appointed program review committee has determined that only 27 programs are subject to review.

2. (KEY) To increase by at least 5% the number of faculty recognized for meritorious performance.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.3

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Total number of faculty recognized	Not applicable ¹	41	44	44	47	47
K	Percentage increase in number of faculty recognized	Not applicable ¹	0.0%	7.3%	7.3%	6.8%	6.8%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

3. (KEY) To increase student retention rates for first year students by 1%.

Strategic Link: Goal II, Objective II.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Retention rates for first year students	Not applicable ¹	63.4%	64.4%	64.4%	65.4%	65.4%
K	Percentage increase in retention rates for first year students	Not applicable ¹	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

4. (KEY) To increase extramural funding through the annual fund campaign and grant writing by 2%.

Strategic Link: Goal II, Objective II.3

Explanatory Note: The original projection of a 30% increase in extramural funding by 2003 was not realistic. A 10% increase is more in line with expected performance in this area. An updated strategic plan in Summer 2000 will reflect this change.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Percentage increase in funding from fund campaign and grant writing	Not applicable ¹	-22.9% ²	2.4%	2.4%	2.0%	2.0%
K	Amount received in annual fund campaign and grant writing	Not applicable ¹	\$6,289,616	\$6,439,778	\$6,439,778	\$6,568,574	\$6,568,574

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² The university received a large, one-time grant in 1997-98 which caused the 1998-99 percent increase to show as a negative number.

NORTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY

Program Authorization: Constitution of 1974, Article 8, Section 5

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Role, Scope, and Mission Statement: Northwestern State University's (NSU) primary service area includes a nine-parish area in rural northwest Louisiana bordered by Texas in the west and Mississippi in the east. In some education endeavors, the university serves the nearby population centers of Alexandria and Shreveport. An open admissions institution, NSU serves the educational needs of this population primarily through arts, humanities, and science programs, and places a strong emphasis on undergraduate professional programs in business, education, and nursing. NSU is home to the Louisiana Scholars College, the state's selective admissions college for the liberal arts. Graduate programs below the doctoral level are offered primarily in clinical psychology, education, arts, and nursing.

The goals of Northwestern State University are:

1. To improve access to higher education services through electronic delivery for citizens of central and northwest Louisiana as defined by the Board of Regents Master Plan.
2. To improve the overall quality and effectiveness of NSU's academic degree programs.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE INFORMATION:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1995-96	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1997-98	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1999-00
Category: SREB FOUR-YEAR 4 ¹			
Admissions Criteria			NO
Student headcount	9,040	8,873	9,005
Student full time equivalent (FTE)	7,943	8,178	8,304
Degrees/awards conferred	1,083	1,222	Due 10/00
State dollars per FTE	\$2,501	\$2,778	\$2,972
Percentage of SREB benchmark	N/A ²	N/A ²	61.7%
Undergraduate mandatory attendance fees	\$2,067	\$2,177	\$2,307
Percentage of SREB benchmark	107.0%	99.2%	Due Fall '00
Mean composite ACT score	19.4	19.4	Due 3/00
Retention of First time freshmen from previous fall			
Campus level	55.6%	56.4%	60.8%
Public post-secondary system	62.3%	65.4%	68.5%
Program accreditation rate	N/A ³	N/A ³	83.9%
Three/six year graduation rate	N/A ⁴	28.4%	Due 6/00

¹ Institution awarding at least 30 master's, education specialist, post-master's, or doctoral degrees with master's, education specialist, and post-master's degrees distributed among at least 5 CIP categories.

² Due to the adoption of a new formula funding, figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

³ Following an 18 month review, BOR adopted mandatory/recommended disciplines for accreditation, therefore figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

⁴ The Federal Department of Education's methodology for calculating graduation rates was implemented in 1997.

OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Unless otherwise indicated, all objectives are to be accomplished during or by the end of FY 2000-2001. Performance indicators are made up of two parts: name and value. The indicator name describes what is being measured. The indicator value is the numeric value or level achieved within a given measurement period. For budgeting purposes, performance indicator values are shown for the prior fiscal year, the current fiscal year, and alternative funding scenarios (continuation budget level and Executive Budget recommendation level) for the ensuing fiscal year (the fiscal year of the budget document).

The objectives and performance indicators that appear below are associated with program funding in the Base Executive Budget for FY 2000-01. Specific information on program funding is presented in the financial sections that follow performance tables.

1. (KEY) To expand by 1% the availability of electronically delivered educational course sections and services in professional program areas.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Percentage increase in the number of course sections delivered electronically	Not applicable ¹	25.0%	4.2%	4.2% ²	1.0%	1.0%
S	Number of course sections electronically delivered to clients via distance learning	Not applicable ¹	95	100	100	101	101

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Although the performance standard is 4.2, the agency estimates a better number to be 5.3.

2. (KEY) To increase by 3% the percentage of all eligible degree programs accredited by a national accrediting agency that is on the Board of Regents' listing of approved accrediting agencies.

Strategic Link: Goal II, Objective II.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of eligible degree programs	Not applicable ¹	32	32	32	32	32
K	Percentage of eligible programs accredited	Not applicable ¹	84.4%	87.5%	87.5%	90.6%	90.6%
K	Percentage increase in the percent of all eligible degree programs accredited	Not applicable ¹	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%	3.1%	3.1%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

3. (SUPPORTING) To submit for review by an independent committee 4 degree programs that do not have a national accrediting agency.

Strategic Link:

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Number of degree programs without accrediting agency	Not applicable ¹	20	20	20 ²	21	21
S	Number of degree programs submitted for external review	Not applicable ¹	0	4	4 ³	4	4
S	Number of programs receiving approval of an external review committee	Not applicable ¹	0	4	4 ³	4	4
S	Percentage of all programs without accrediting agencies receiving approval by an external review team	Not applicable ¹	0%	20%	20% ⁴	19%	19%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Although the performance standard is 20, because a new program was added the agency estimates a better number to be 21.

³ Although the performance standard is 4, the agency estimates a better number to be 1.

⁴ Although the performance standard is 20%, the agency estimates a better number to be 5%.

4. (SUPPORTING) To maintain the passage rate on state and/or national licensure examinations for completers of undergraduate degree programs requiring licensure for professional practice.

Strategic Link: Goal II, Objective II.3

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Number of students taking licensure examinations	Not applicable ¹	410	420	420	430	430
S	Percentage of students receiving passing scores	Not applicable ¹	92.9%	93.6% ²	93.6% ²	94.0%	94.0%
S	Percentage increase in passage rate	Not applicable ¹	Not available	0.7%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Although the performance standard is 93.6%, the agency estimates a better number to be 94.0%.

5. (KEY) To increase the percentage of full-time undergraduate students completing degree programs within 6 years by 1%.

Strategic Link: Goal II, Objective II.4

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Percentage increase of first-time, full-time freshmen at entry graduating within 6 years (Based on fall 1994 students)	Not applicable ¹	Not available ²	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
K	Percentage of first-time, full-time freshmen at entry graduating within 6 years (Based on fall 1994 students)	Not applicable ¹	26.1%	27.1%	27.1%	28.1%	28.1%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Data for this indicator will not be available until Spring 2000.

SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY

Program Authorization: Constitution of 1974, Article 8; Act 313 of 1975

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Role, Scope, and Mission Statement: The mission of Southeastern Louisiana University (SLU) is to meet the educational and cultural needs, primarily of southeast Louisiana, to disseminate knowledge and to facilitate life-long learning through quality instruction, research and service in a safe, student-centered environment.

The goals of Southeastern Louisiana University are:

1. To enhance student success at the university.
2. To recruit and retain a culturally diverse student body.
3. To possess a state-of-the-art technology infrastructure appropriate for higher education.
4. To expand partnerships between the university and the external community.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE INFORMATION:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1995-96	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1997-98	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1999-00
Category: SREB FOUR -YEAR 4 ¹			
Admissions Criteria			YES
Student headcount	14,238	15,241	15,175
Student full time equivalent (FTE)	12,061	13,482	13,568
Degrees/awards conferred	1,442	1,664	Due 10/00
State dollars per FTE	\$2,289	\$2,377	\$2,826
Percentage of SREB benchmark	N/A ²	N/A ²	59.5%
Undergraduate mandatory attendance fees	\$1,930	\$1,930	\$2,030
Percentage of SREB benchmark	99.9%	87.9%	Due Fall '00
Mean composite ACT score	18.7	18.7	Due 3/00
Retention of First time freshmen from previous fall			
Campus level	61.8%	62.5%	60.6%
Public post-secondary system	67.5%	69.3%	68.3%
Program accreditation rate	N/A ³	N/A ³	88.9%
Three/six year graduation rate	N/A ⁴	20.8%	Due 6/00

¹ Institution awarding at least 30 master's, education specialist, post-master's, or doctoral degrees with master's, education specialist, and post-master's degrees distributed among at least 5 CIP categories.

² Due to the adoption of a new formula funding, figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

³ Following an 18 month review, BOR adopted mandatory/recommended disciplines for accreditation, therefore figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

⁴ The Federal Department of Education's methodology for calculating graduation rates was implemented in 1997.

OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Unless otherwise indicated, all objectives are to be accomplished during or by the end of FY 2000-2001. Performance indicators are made up of two parts: name and value. The indicator name describes what is being measured. The indicator value is the numeric value or level achieved within a given measurement period. For budgeting purposes, performance indicator values are shown for the prior fiscal year, the current fiscal year, and alternative funding scenarios (continuation budget level and Executive Budget recommendation level) for the ensuing fiscal year (the fiscal year of the budget document).

The objectives and performance indicators that appear below are associated with program funding in the Base Executive Budget for FY 2000-01. Specific information on program funding is presented in the financial sections that follow performance tables.

1. (SUPPORTING) To increase by at least 1% the number of well-prepared freshmen entering Southeastern by maximizing scholarship opportunities for academically prepared students.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Amount of scholarship dollars offered to academically able beginning freshman ¹	Not applicable ²	\$4,519,230 ³	\$4,900,000	\$4,900,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
S	Percentage of incoming freshman with ACT composite scores of 19 or greater ⁴	Not applicable ²	53.9%	55.0%	55.0% ⁵	55.3%	55.3%

¹ Includes all scholarships offered to beginning freshman in which some criterion of academic performance is required for the award. Source: Office of Financial Aid.

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

³ Estimated amount awarded including \$3,460,154 in TOPS scholarships.

⁴ Based on all incoming first-time freshmen, Fall 14th Class day extract files, Student Record System, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.

⁵ Actual measurement reported by the agency in LAPAS is 54.3%.

2. (KEY) To develop intensive skills enhancement/college preparation programs with cooperating feeder high schools, thereby reducing the university resources being used for remedial education to 1.70% of the university budget.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.2

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of high school students participating in programs ¹	Not applicable ²	244	250	250	275	275
K	Percentage of university operating budget spent on remedial education ³	Not applicable ²	1.81%	1.75%	1.75%	1.70%	1.70%

¹ Source: College of Basic Studies

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

³ This performance indicator should reflect a decrease over time. Budget percentage based on adjusted budget for budget unit 1160; includes summer, overload, and lecturer adjustments. Source: Office of the Controller.

3. (SUPPORTING) To promote student retention and progression by reviewing and modifying current programs such that the number of required credit hours is decreased by at least 5% on average.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.3

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Median number of credit hours required in baccalaureate degree programs ¹	Not applicable ²	132	125	125 ³	122	122
S	Average time to degree in semesters ⁴	Not applicable ²	18.0	17.8	17.8	17.5	17.5
S	Freshmen student retention rate ⁵	Not applicable ²	62.1%	66.0%	66.0% ⁶	66.0%	66.0%

¹ Based on catalog of record for the academic year indicated. Source: Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

³ Actual number reported in LAPAS is 122.

⁴ Calculated based on number of semesters required for degree completion for students graduating in the academic year indicated. Each academic year consists of 3 semesters - Summer, Fall, and Spring. Does not include transfer students. Source: Completer extract files, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.

⁵ Calculated based on beginning full-time freshman retention from Fall of previous year to Fall of academic year indicated. Source: Fall 14th Class day extract files, Student Record System, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.

⁶ Actual number reported in LAPAS is 63.1%.

4. (KEY) To increase by at least .5% the number of minority students at the university and to increase by at least 5% the number of international students admitted and enrolled.

Strategic Link: Goal II, Objective II.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Minority (non-white) students as a percentage of institutional headcount ¹	Not applicable ²	15.3%	16.0%	16.0% ³	16.5%	16.5%
S	Number of minority (non-white) students admitted and enrolled ¹	Not applicable ²	2342	2400	2400 ⁴	2502	2502
S	Number of international students admitted and enrolled ¹	Not applicable ²	116	125	125 ⁵	200	200
K	Percentage increase in international students over previous year ⁶	Not applicable ²	12.6%	7.8%	7.8% ⁷	5.3%	5.3%

¹ Source: Based on student ethnicity variables, Fall 14th Class day extract files, Student Record System, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

³ The current performance level is 16.5.

⁴ The current performance level is 2502.

⁵ The current performance level is 190.

⁶ Source: Based on student home residence variables, Fall 14th Class day extract files, Student Record System, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.

⁷ The current performance level is 63.8%.

5. (SUPPORTING) To increase at least 2.0% retention of culturally diverse freshmen at the university by promoting and valuing cultural diversity and by providing programs that strengthen retention.

Strategic Link: Goal II, Objective II.2

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Freshmen retention rate of culturally diverse students ¹	Not applicable ²	64.3%	17.5%	17.5% ³	66.1%	66.1%
S	Increase in freshmen retention rate of culturally diverse students over previous year	Not applicable ²	0.2%	2.0%	2.0% ⁴	0.1%	0.1%

¹ Calculated based on beginning full-time freshmen retention from Fall of previous year to Fall of academic year indicated. Source: Fall 14th Class day extract files, Student Record System, Office on Institutional Research and Assessment.

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

³ The current performance level is 65.0.

⁴ The current performance level is .7%.

6. (KEY) To increase by at least 10% the modern computing equipment available to students and to increase by at least 5% the number of students engaged in technology-based instruction.

Strategic Link: Goal III, Objective III.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Percentage increase in number of new/updated campus computer stations made available to students compared to previous year ¹	Not applicable ²	25.1%	19.6%	19.6%	10.0%	10.0%
K	Percentage increase in the number of students served in technology-based courses over the previous year ³	Not applicable ²	1.7%	7.7%	7.7% ⁴	7.1%	7.1%
S	Number of new/updated campus computer stations made available to students	Not applicable ²	209	250	250	275	275
S	Number of students served in technology-based courses ³	Not applicable ²	650	700	700	750	750

¹ Source: Office to Technology.

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

³ Courses include satellite-delivered, telecourse, compressed video, and 100% Internet delivery. Source: Office of Continuing Education.

⁴ The number reported in LAPAS is 20.9%.

7. (SUPPORTING) To improve the technology infrastructure for efficient university administration by increasing the number of modern computing stations available to faculty and staff by at least 10%.

Strategic Link: Goal III, Objective III.2

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Percentage of faculty/ staff computer stations meeting the campus computing standard ¹	Not applicable ²	55%	60%	60%	70%	70%
S	Percentage increase in number of faculty/staff computer stations meeting the campus computing standard compared to previous year ¹	Not applicable ²	3%	5%	5%	10%	10%

¹ Based on number of faculty/staff computer stations have a Pentium 75MHz configuration or better. Source: Office of Technology.

² This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

8. (SUPPORTING) To expand by at least 5% partnerships that benefit pre K-12 teachers and pre K-12 students.

Strategic Link: Goal IV, Objective IV.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Number of partnerships between the university and the pre-K-12 community	Not applicable ¹	45	48	48	50	50
S	Number of pre K-12 students and teachers affected by partnerships ²	Not applicable ¹	125,000	128,000	128,000	129,000	129,000
S	Percentage increase in number of partnerships ²	Not applicable ¹	12.5%	6.7%	6.7%	4.2%	4.2%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Number of formal and informal cooperative agreements between the university and local public schools or school systems that resulted in educational benefits for the students.
Source: Office of Academic Services.

9. (KEY) To expand existing partnerships between the university and business, industry, and government by at least 20%.

Strategic Link: Goal IV. Objective IV.2

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Percentage increase in number of partnerships from previous year	Not applicable ¹	25.0%	5.0%	5.0%	20.0%	20.0%
K	Number of grant dollars generated by research projects that have potential for patents, innovations, and technology transfer ²	Not applicable ¹	Not applicable	Not applicable ³	Not applicable	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000
S	Number of partnerships between the university and business, industry and government	Not applicable ¹	20	21	21	24	24
S	Number of constituents affected by university/business partnerships	Not applicable ¹	200,000	205,000	205,000	\$235,000	\$235,000

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Source: Office of Sponsored Research and Grants.

³ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 10 and therefore has no performance standard for 1999-00.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA – LAFAYETTE

Program A: Constitution of 1974, Article 8, Sections 5-13 et seq.; R.S. 17

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Role, Scope, and Mission Statement: The University of Louisiana at Lafayette, a member of the University of Louisiana System, is a public, Doctoral II institution of higher education offering associate, bachelor's, masters' and doctoral degrees. Its academic programs are administered by the Colleges of Applied Life Sciences, the Arts, Business Administration, Education, Engineering, General Studies, Liberal Arts, Nursing, Sciences and the Graduate School. The university is dedicated to achieving excellence in undergraduate and graduate education, in research and in public service. For undergraduate education, this commitment implies a fundamental subscription to general education, rooted in the primacy of the traditional liberal arts and sciences as the core around which all curricula are developed. The graduate curricula seek to develop scholars who will variously advance knowledge, cultivate aesthetic sensibility, and improve the material conditions of humankind. The university reaffirms its historic commitment to diversity and integration. Thus, through instruction, research, and service, the university promotes regional economic and cultural development, explores solutions to national and world issues, and advances its reputation among its peers.

The goals of the University of Louisiana at Lafayette are:

1. To strengthen academic quality.
2. To increase the use of technology in teaching and learning activities.
3. To expand the role of the university in support of regional economic competitiveness and cultural development.
4. To strengthen fiscal stability and public accountability.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE INFORMATION:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1995-96	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1997-98	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1999-00
Category: SREB FOUR-YEAR 2 ¹			
Admissions Criteria			YES
Student headcount	16,902	17,020	16,351
Student full time equivalent (FTE)	13,960	15,131	14,877
Degrees/awards conferred	1,992	2,098	Due 10/00
State dollars per FTE	\$2,967	\$3,142	\$3,342
Percentage of SREB benchmark	N/A ²	N/A ²	60.4%
Undergraduate mandatory attendance fees	\$1,898	\$1,898	\$2,013
Percentage of SREB benchmark	77.1%	72.6%	Due Fall '00
Mean composite ACT score	19.3	19.4	Due 3/00
Retention of First time freshmen from previous fall			
Campus level	60.7%	63.2%	63.0%
Public post-secondary system	68.5%	69.5%	71.6%
Program accreditation rate	N/A ³	N/A ³	96.3%
Three/six year graduation rate	N/A ⁴	25.0%	Due 6/00

¹ Institution awarding at least 30 doctoral degrees that are distributed among at least 5 CIP categories.

² Due to the adoption of a new formula funding, figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

³ Following an 18 month review, BOR adopted mandatory/recommended disciplines for accreditation, therefore figures for FY 96 and FY 98 are not comparable to FY 00.

⁴ The Federal Department of Education's methodology for calculating graduation rates was implemented in 1997.

OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Unless otherwise indicated, all objectives are to be accomplished during or by the end of FY 2000-2001. Performance indicators are made up of two parts: name and value. The indicator name describes what is being measured. The indicator value is the numeric value or level achieved within a given measurement period. For budgeting purposes, performance indicator values are shown for the prior fiscal year, the current fiscal year, and alternative funding scenarios (continuation budget level and Executive Budget recommendation level) for the ensuing fiscal year (the fiscal year of the budget document).

The objectives and performance indicators that appear below are associated with program funding in the Base Executive Budget for FY 2000-01. Specific information on program funding is presented in the financial sections that follow performance tables.

1. (KEY) To improve freshman to sophomore retention rate by 3%.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Freshman to sophomore retention rate	Not applicable ¹	64.0%	70.4%	70.4%	72.5%	72.5%
K	Percentage change in freshman to sophomore retention rate	Not applicable ¹	2.7%	10.0%	10.0%	3.0%	3.0%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

2. (KEY) To attain 100% accreditation of eligible professional curricula.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.4

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Count of accredited professional curricula	Not applicable ¹	53	55	55 ²	53	53
K	Percentage of eligible professional curricula which are accredited	Not applicable ¹	96%	100%	100% ³	100%	100%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Although the performance standard is 55, the agency estimates a better number to be 52.

³ Although the performance standard is 100%, the agency estimates a better number to be 98.1%.

3. (SUPPORTING) To increase number of internally or externally supported graduate assistantships, fellowships and post-doctoral assistantships by 1.0%.

Strategic Link: Goal I, Objective I.6

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Count of internally or externally supported graduate research assistantships and post-doctoral assistantships	Not applicable ¹	943	852	852 ²	947	947
S	Percentage change in count of internally or externally supported graduate research assistantships and post-doctoral assistantships from prior year	Not applicable ¹	0.0%	2.5%	2.5% ³	1.0%	1.0%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Although the performance standard is 852, the agency estimates a better number to be 964.

³ Although the performance standard is 2.5%, the agency estimates a better number to be -0.5%.

4. (SUPPORTING) To increase external funding for applied research by 3.9%.

Strategic Link: Goal II, Objective III.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Amount of external funding for applied research	Not applicable ¹	\$11,000,000	\$11,550,000	\$11,550,000	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000
S	Percentage change in amount of external funding for applied research	Not applicable ¹	10.0%	5.0%	5.0%	3.9%	3.9%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

5. (SUPPORTING) To expand the capability of the Research Park by 2 new facilities.

Strategic Link: Goal III, Objective III.2

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Number of facilities in Research Park	Not applicable ¹	3	5	5	7	7
S	Change in number of facilities in Research Park from prior year	Not applicable ¹	1	2	2	2	2

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

6. (SUPPORTING) To increase privately held assets to \$75 million.

Strategic Link: Goal IV, Objective IV.1

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Amount of privately held assets	Not applicable ¹	\$40,000,000	\$44,000,000	\$44,000,000 ²	\$75,000,000	\$75,000,000
S	Percentage change in amount of privately held assets	Not applicable ¹	8.7%	10.0%	10.0% ³	15.4%	15.4%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Although the performance standard is \$44,000,000, the agency estimates a better number to be \$65,000,000.

³ Although the performance standard is 10.0%, the agency estimates a better number to be 62.5%.

7. (SUPPORTING) To increase externally funded research and sponsored programs awards to \$20.5 million.

Strategic Link: Goal IV, Objective IV.2

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Amount of externally funded research and sponsored programs	Not applicable ¹	\$19,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$20,500,000	\$20,500,000
S	Percentage of projected amount of externally funded research and sponsored program awards received	Not applicable ¹	73.1%	76.9%	76.9%	78.8%	78.8%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

8. (KEY) To maintain 0 compliance findings and 0 internal control findings as reported in the Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs in Audit Reports.

Strategic Link: Goal IV, Objective IV.3

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Count of compliance findings and internal control findings	Not applicable ¹	0	0	0	0	0

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

9. (SUPPORTING) To decrease student contribution as a percentage of Education and General (E&G) expenditures by 1.4%.

Strategic Link: Goal IV, Objective IV.4

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Percentage of UL Lafayette student contribution versus E&G expenditures	Not applicable ¹	36.0%	34.0%	34.0% ²	34.5%	34.5%
S	Percentage decrease in UL Lafayette student contribution as a percentage of E&G expenditures	Not applicable ¹	2.7%	2.9%	2.9% ³	1.4%	1.4%

¹ This performance indicator did not appear in Act 19 and therefore has no performance standard for 1998-99.

² Although the performance standard is 34.0%, the agency estimates a better number to be 35.

³ Although the performance standard is 2.9%, the agency estimates a better number to be 2.8%.